

ANNIVERSARY ADDRESS,

DELIVERED BEFORE THE



Anthropological Society of London,

JANUARY 3RD, 1866.

BY

JAMES HUNT, PH.D., F.S.A., F.R.S.L., F.A.S.L.,

HONORARY FOREIGN SECRETARY OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF LITERATURE OF GREAT BRITAIN,
FOREIGN ASSOCIATE OF THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF PARIS,
HONORARY FELLOW OF THE ETHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON,
MEMBER OF THE IMPERIAL LEOPOLDINO-CAROLINA ACADEMIA NATURÆ CURIOSORUM,
CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE UPPER HESSE SOCIETY FOR NATURAL AND MEDICAL SCIENCE,
AND OF THE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF HESSE DARMSTADT,
AND
PRESIDENT OF THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1866.

Price Sixpence.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/b22342151>

ANNUAL ADDRESS

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON,

JANUARY 3RD, 1866.

By JAMES HUNT, Esq., Ph.D., F.S.A., F.R.S.L., F.A.S.L., PRESIDENT.

GENTLEMEN,—I propose to make a few remarks on a subject which I introduced to your notice at our last anniversary, viz., the definition of our science. I also spoke at that time on the history of the word Anthropology. Since that occasion I have read Mr. Bendyshe's admirable history of the word, and sufficient has been said by him on that point to render it unnecessary for me to add thereto.

The history of the first use of terms is a trifling matter compared with what ought to be their definition at the present time. This subject is one of the greatest importance, and we cannot pay too much attention to it, inasmuch as the future success of our science will depend in a considerable degree on a clear definition of our terminology. All sciences have certain well-defined subdivisions. Thus, in geology, there is palæontology, geography, and geognosy, which are analogous to the divisions of our science proposed last year, viz., historical anthropology, descriptive anthropology, and comparative anthropology. The question arises, are these three definitions sufficient? I now beg to offer a few suggestions on this point. To show its importance, I will briefly narrate what took place at a meeting of our parent society in Paris only in May last.

Towards the end of the sitting on May 18th, a somewhat lengthy conversation took place between MM. Rochet and Broca on the signification, the scope, and the limits of anthropology. The questions raised by M. Rochet chiefly related to the insufficiency of the notion given by article 1. of the statutes relative to the objects of the society, which is indicated as being *the scientific study of the races of mankind*. If these words, said M. Rochet, are taken in this restricted sense, it is clear that the society has constantly departed from its objects, since it has occupied itself not merely with human races, but with man and the industry of man, and all manifestations of his activity. That

there is accumulated in the *Bulletins* and *Mémoires* a mass of documents for which it is difficult to find a centre. M. Rochet, being desirous to learn whether certain works he is now engaged in belong to anthropology and may find their place in the publications of the society, said he would feel obliged if such members of the society as might be able to enlighten him on this point, would give him a more precise definition of anthropology than is contained in the statutes.

M. Broca, after stating that on several occasions, and specially in his history on the labours of the society published in the second volume of the *Mémoires*, the questions of M. Rochet had been replied to, said that he could not better explain the phrase of the statutes than by giving the history of the foundation of the society. He showed the necessity in which the founders found themselves in the presence of the distrust of the government to keep to this laconic and insufficient phrase. But he thought that he expressed the opinion of most of his colleagues, by saying that Anthropology is the study of the human group, not merely by itself, but also in its relation to the rest of nature; the differential characters of anthropology on the one hand, and those of history, biology, and archæology on the other, indicating, at the same time, how far these schemes are connected with anthropology. M. Broca reminded M. Rochet that at all times artistic productions have served to characterise the races of the past as documents characterise the present races, inasmuch as they reveal particular aptitudes.

These remarks show how advisable it has become for all anthropologists to possess some clear conception and definition of the objects and limits of their science. When an anthropological society was to have been founded in Paris in 1846, objection was taken by the government of that day to the formation of such a society. Even at the present day, we cannot say how far our fellow-students are able to declare the full meaning and extent of anthropological science.

It will, however, be seen from M. Broca's reply, that there is really little difference of opinion as to the definition of the science of anthropology by ourselves and by our Parisian colleagues. Being agreed on this point, it would be very advisable if we could also agree as to the divisions of our science. It is with the hope of eliciting some discussion on this point, and also because I think the classification proposed last year to some extent unsatisfactory, that I now propose the addition of another division of our science, under the title of **ARCHAIC ANTHROPOLOGY**.

Twelve months since, I suggested that all subjects which throw light on man's history should be classified under the head of "Historical Anthropology"; a term used by Rudolph Wagner, but which was originally proposed by Christian Daniel Beck, a Professor of Ancient Literature in the University of Leipsic, as early as 1813, in his *Universal History*. By this writer, historical anthropology is made to include mythology, language, genealogy, etc. I think it would be advisable for us still to continue to confine the meaning of historical anthropology to man's psychological history, and to introduce

another term for his physical history. The term "human palæontology" was formerly and is now used to denote this branch of our science; but although sufficiently explicit, it is not well suited to supplement the titles of the other three. I propose, therefore, to take the root of the word archæology, and to include under the term "archaic anthropology" all subjects which illustrate man's past physical history. Historical anthropology will then be limited to man's psychological history.

Skulls, worked stones, tumuli, architecture, and all tangible things will be included in the former; mythology, history, creeds, superstitions, in the latter. Every writer on the antiquity of man has occasion to speak in some way of what has been called the archæological evidence. Thus an author, whose loss we all deplore, the late eminent Dr. Hugh Falconer, observes, "Geology has never disdained to draw upon any department of human knowledge what could throw light on the subjects which it investigates. Cuvier, in the *Discours Préliminaire*, exhausted the records and traditions of every ancient people in search of arguments to support the opinion that the advent of man upon the earth dates from a comparatively late epoch. At the present time the whole aspect of the subject is transformed. The science is now intimately connected with archæological ethnology in searching for evidence of the hands of man in the oldest quaternary fluvial gravels of Europe."*

The expression, "Archæological Ethnology", is, to say the least, a most infelicitous one. In the first place, it is not a question in any way connected with ethnology according to any definition which I have ever heard given to that word; and in the second, there is certainly no necessity for two "logos" terminations. To use the author's own words, the search is for "evidence of the works of man" and is not in any way connected with the question of race. I therefore beg to suggest that for the future it would be advisable (until a more suitable classification or expression is proposed) to use the term "ARCHAIC ANTHROPOLOGY" instead of the most indefinite word "archæology." We shall then have:—

1. Archaic anthropology, or the past history of man, from his physical remains and works.

2. Historical anthropology, or the past history of mankind, as deduced from mythology, creeds, superstitions, language, traditions, etc.

3. Descriptive anthropology, or the description of man and mankind.

4. Comparative anthropology, or the comparison of different men and different races of men with one another in the first place, and a comparison of man with the lower animals in the second.

The questions then arise; do these subdivisions all go to make up one science which has a centre within itself? Can any of these divisions be taken away and a veritable science yet remain? Do these divisions include the whole science of man?

The first two treat of man's past history, and all must admit we ought to know all that can be known on this point in order to form a science of the present. But it may fairly be asked is there any ne-

* "Journal of the Geological Society", No. lxxxiv, p. 383.

cessity to divide archaic from historical anthropology? It appears to me advisable that we should have a physical historical anthropology, and a psychological historical anthropology. If we call the former archaic anthropology, and the latter historical anthropology, we shall be simply following out the separation which for a long time has subsisted between archæology and history. The word archæology has been used in such a variety of senses, and also in such an extended sense as to be made to include everything old, and some things new. Church architecture and corporation seals now afford much discussion to the archæologist. The other day I heard it announced that the study of the postage stamps of different nations was an interesting branch of archæology!

In using the term archaic anthropology we must guard against giving it such a vague meaning as archæology has now acquired. We must also endeavour to draw a pretty clear division between what is to be respectively called archaic and historical anthropology. All forms of palæography and ancient art should belong to historical anthropology. A cromlech would belong to archaic anthropology, but if inscriptions be found on it, that part will belong to historical anthropology: and thus the one will be the handmaid of the other. Archaic anthropology will help to give us the history of ancient humanity; historical anthropology brings us into closer communion with them, and both will combine to enable us to build up a science of man in the past and the present.

I have heard it remarked during the past year, that the terms descriptive anthropology and comparative anthropology are defective, inasmuch as we cannot compare until we have described. To this objection, I reply, that we may describe without comparing. Descriptive anthropology is, like geography, no science in itself, because it only describes. Every traveller who describes the people with whom he comes in contact, whether conscious of the fact or not, is a descriptive anthropologist, but not necessarily a comparative anthropologist. Homer, Herodotus, Pausanias, Strabo, Diodorus Siculus were rather descriptive anthropologists than comparative anthropologists. Perhaps the first comparative anthropologist was Tacitus, and he was also a descriptive anthropologist. It is not, however, necessary that the comparative anthropologist should also be a descriptive anthropologist, although it may be advisable that a man should learn to describe before he begins to compare. A man might be a very good comparative anthropologist on the correct observation of his brother, the descriptive anthropologist. A man may be a very good archaic anthropologist, without knowing anything of ancient inscriptions, art, myths, or traditions, and *vice versa*. Each branch can be defined with sufficient exactness, but cannot in practice be separated if we want to establish a veritable science of man.

Attempts have frequently been made to divide the science of anthropology into branches. Steffens, a distinguished anthropologist, who published a work on the subject in 1822,* proposed making three divisions of the science of anthropology: 1. Geological anthro-

* "Anthropologie", Breslau, 1822, 2 vols.

pology, 2. Physiological anthropology, and 3. Psychological anthropology. We also find Nasse, in the *Zeitschrift für Anthropologie*, 1825, proposing to make two divisions under the titles physiological and psychological anthropology. More than forty years ago we find him making the following remarks, which illustrate what was the meaning of anthropology to his mind at that time. "The evolution and origin of language cannot be neglected by the anthropologist. How did the variations in the human species arise? The history of human nature from the earliest period to the present time presents questions which anthropology must endeavour to answer, or at least to elucidate. Has the human race degenerated or improved? Neither is physiological anthropology an appendix to psychology, nor the latter an appendix to the former. The relations of psychical to physiological life, and *vice versa*, belong neither to physiology nor psychology, but form an integral part of anthropology."

The Germans possess a great advantage over English authors, inasmuch as they may, without subjecting themselves to the animadversions of hypercritics, select expressive terms from the vernacular tongue. They have thus for ethnography, *Volksbeschreibung*, folks-description; for ethnology, *Völkerkunde*, folks-knowledge; and for anthropology, *Menschenkenntniss*, i.e. man-knowledge, constituting, in a restricted sense, the science of man considered individually in all his aspects, physical, intellectual, and moral; and the science of mankind when viewed collectively. They look therefore upon ethnography and ethnology as subdivisions of anthropology.

I am quite willing to admit that "folks-description" is as good a term as "ethnography." "*Folks-knowledge*" is also no doubt quite equal to ethnology in scientific exactness, although Prichard, the father of English ethnology, attached a different meaning to that word; but "folks-knowledge" is certainly not so expressive as the term comparative anthropology, the suitability of which is becoming more appreciated every day.

It has been interesting to watch the discussion which has been going on during the past year respecting the definition of the words anthropology and ethnology. A remarkable feature of this controversy in our own country is the curious forgetfulness on the part of some of the combatants, of the fact that certain words are doomed to extinction, while others, by an inherent law of "selection", live and become generally accepted. The use of the word anthropology, and the development of a great science under that name, is not the work of a few individuals, but is a part of the intellectual development of Europe. The British Association has ignored this fact, and from other quarters we have received credit which we do not deserve. Some words, like some existing species of plants, animals, and even men, appear doomed to become extinct. In Germany I learn that the word ethnology has ceased to be used. Dr. Carl Vogt writes me in a letter dated August 28, 1865, "Ethnology embraces a very secondary and confined branch of anthropology; for the aim of the latter science is to study and know man in all his phases, and not merely as to the branches and peoples, into which the human race

can be subdivided. Truly we should think ourselves very ridiculous, and every one would look upon us as upon those men in powdered wigs of your lords and baronets, only destined to mount behind the chariot of science, by adopting this antique word, which is no longer used in Germany. We must have the entire race, the complete *ανθρώπος*, as it is scattered and buried in the beds of the earth, and not these ephemeral apparitions, the combined results of artificial and natural selection, which are called peoples and nations."

A very praiseworthy attempt has been made on the part of some of our fellow-countrymen during the past year to act as a sort of "Aborigines Protection Society" towards the word ethnology. A periodical called the *Ethnological Journal* was started apparently for this special purpose; but nature's laws appear to have doomed this word, if not to total extinction, at least to a very modified signification from that proposed by the supporters of this periodical. In France attempts are also being made to retain the word ethnography: but the following extract from M. Léon de Rosny will show in what sense this word is there used.

M. Léon de Rosny, speaking as an ethnographer, says, "Anthropology, nevertheless, as a natural science, must not be neglected; far from it. It nevertheless seems to us, that the principles of this science remain yet to be discovered, whilst *philology* rests upon an ensemble of positive laws which preclude it groping in the dark." He also says that ethnography is essentially distinct from anthropology—the former being an *historical*, and the latter a *natural*, science.

When it was announced before the Paris Anthropological Society on November 3, 1864, that the British Association had decided that anthropology was included in ethnology, the statement was received with roars of laughter—really the only sensible reception which could be given to such a monstrous assertion.

On this point I cannot do better than quote the opinion of Dr. Pruner-Bey, the late President, for 1865, of our parent society. In a letter to myself, dated August 26th, 1865, he says:—

"I sincerely hope that the family quarrel will be settled to your own and our satisfaction. About that truly German verbal quarrel, I must frankly confess that in this particular case, in my humble opinion, the right is on your side. Anthropology, a general and comprehensive term, signifies the science of man (in the abstract, and in every respect); whilst Ethnology is the science of nations, and falls by this specification under the head of the first. Finally, ethnography is the merely descriptive part, and bears the same relation to anthropology as geography bears to geology. Anthropology, as the present generation understands it, has to be worked out by other means and methods than those at the disposal of our predecessors.

"This last remark must not be interpreted as tending to throw blame on those men whom I have always considered as my masters, but as the simple expression of a conviction quite as deeply rooted in my mind as is my gratitude to them. Every epoch of human civilised existence has its object; and that of the present day is universal

knowledge (of course within the limits of human understanding) for gradually establishing practical universal principles. If I am right in this, anthropology will not beat ethnology, but, like a hopeful child, will embrace and take care of its worthy mother."

But I need not go out of our own country to prove that ethnology is merely a department of anthropology; and, not to dwell further on such a topic, I will conclude this portion of my subject by commending the following remarks* by Professor Huxley to the notice of the Ethnological Society and the British Association:—

"Ethnology, as thus defined, is a branch of anthropology, the great science which unravels the complexities of human structure; traces out the relation of man to other animals; studies all that is especially human in the mode in which man's complex functions are performed; and searches after the conditions which have determined his presence in the world."

No one can deplore more than myself the position which has been taken by our ethnological brethren with regard to our admission to the British Association. It is quite impossible for us to see the logic of, or the reason for, the position they have there assumed with regard to our science. The only clue which, I believe, ethnologists have ever published as to their motives for opposing us is to be found in the columns of a recently published periodical,† in which we find these words: "If the new section is to bear the name of anthropology, its government must necessarily devolve on the Anthropological Society, which far outnumbers the Ethnological. If the name ethnology is preserved, there is at least an additional chance that the minority in the amalgamated body will retain some moderate portion of the influence due to their intrinsic character."

If this jealousy of our influence is the true cause for the opposition offered to us by ethnologists, time has been wasted on verbal distinctions. We are glad, however, to know what the real cause is. If the logic of the above extract leads us to the true reason for the opposition of ethnologists, we are willing to give them credit for acting in an intelligible manner, although we may not be able to admire such a spirit in men of science.

As long as men are influenced by such petty jealousy as that displayed in the extract I have quoted, it is not likely that they will be amenable to reason. We shall be glad to see whether they will disclaim such motives, and that in a practical manner, by joining with us to obtain a special section for the science of man in the British Association. Had they told us before that they feared a loss of influence if our name were used for the new section, we should have been ready to reassure them on that point.

At Birmingham, I officially declared that it was the thing we wanted—a special section for the science of man; and that we were prepared to make the name entirely a secondary consideration. An alliance, however, had been entered into between the ethnologists and a section of the geographers, and we were opposed on all points. Exception

* "Fortnightly Review", June 15th, 1865.

† "Ethnological Journal", September 1865, p. 145.

has been taken to the means used to prevent our carrying our proposal at some future day ; and, perhaps, not without just cause. In saying this, however, I have no intention or desire to convey the impression that this society is in antagonism to the British Association ; on the contrary, I wish emphatically to proclaim that such is not the fact. We are simply fighting against those who have used their power and influence to destroy the position which a branch of the science of man once held in the British Association. We have a large and increasing number of supporters in the Association ; and, had not the Council arrogated to themselves powers which they have never before assumed, there is no doubt we should have carried our motion next year. Under actual circumstances it was not thought advisable to give notice for the same motion until we have really some chance of carrying it.

As it is now settled, the science of man is to go to the biological section, and ethnology is to remain with geography in Section E. Is then, ethnology no part of the science of man ?

I trust that the authorities will take this matter into their most earnest and serious consideration, and not allow themselves to be dictated to by anyone, but simply consider how they can best advance the cause of science. Their present position cannot be defended.

The cause of anthropologists and ethnologists is the same when asking for a special section for the science of man. If we were united, we could demand this from the Association. "Unite and conquer," is as true as "divide and be conquered."

Supposing, too, the loss of influence by the ethnologists is a legitimate reason for their opposition to the proposal we made last year, I would remark, then, that they are no better off where they are. At present they have not the "influence due to their intrinsic character." Fifteen years experience has shown that there can be no real scientific discussion on any branch of the science of man in Section E, as at present constituted.

I feel it, however, my duty, to take this opportunity of publicly returning the warmest thanks of myself and my colleagues to Sir Roderick Murchison, Mr. Crawford, and those gentlemen who have united with them to prevent our recognition by the Association. Much of our success during the past year is to be ascribed to this opposition on their part. The longer this is continued the better will it be for this Society. If, therefore, we do not obtain a section for the science of man in the Association, we gain very considerable strength from their opposition to such a proposal.

Our success is now simply a question of time. The more unfairly our science is treated, the sooner will it be recognised. The action of the Council last year obtained us very many members ; and, besides this, it has aroused the energy of some of our Fellows who had hitherto taken no active part in the affairs of the Society. When the history of this struggle in the British Association comes to be written, it will be most instructive, as illustrating the state of a portion of the scientific mind of England in the middle of this century. As M. Broca well says : "The contest which has commenced before the British Associa-

tion is truly very curious . . . and when all this shall have passed away, no one will ever believe in the historical reality of this resistance." The struggle began twenty years ago, and may perhaps go on for that time longer.

When the Council of the British Association recommended that the science of man should be included in the Biological Section, they no doubt anticipated that this arrangement, being some concession to our demands, might be accepted by us. The authorities of the British Association are now trying to do what was attempted with anthropology more than thirty years ago in Germany. Nasse, writing in 1823, and speaking of the attempt at separation of the different branches of anthropological science, says: "This separation has been very injurious to anthropological inquiry; for, according to it, man has been delivered up to two separate faculties—his psychical part to philosophers, his physical part to physiologists. Even at present, endeavours are still being made to keep these inquiries separate." It is not a little strange that some of our men of science should assume the same attitude towards anthropology as that taken upwards of forty years ago by some men of science in Germany.

Why all this dread of anthropology? Why do men who have spent the earlier part of their lives in furthering the cause of science, endeavour to attain public applause from the masses by arresting its further development? What made a leading member of the British Association utter the vain boast that he had made "the coffin of the anthropologists"? The reply to the last question may perhaps be found in the speech of Cassius.

"Why, man, he doth bestride the narrow world
Like a Colossus; and we petty men
Walk under his huge legs, and peep about
To find ourselves dishonourable graves."

Such boasters do much to bring the name and the cause of science into contempt. It should ever be the object of those who conduct this Society, to do so in such a truly scientific manner, as not to allow it to fall into the state of one, at least, of our existing scientific societies. I allude to the unfortunate position to which Sir Roderick Murchison, Bart., has brought the Royal Geographical Society. From a useful scientific body of students of physical geography, this society has degenerated under his *régime* to a fashionable *réunion*. This is not the fault of the portion of science to which that society should be devoted, but is an admirable illustration of the evil effects of courting public applause. I merely mention the Geographical Society as an illustration of what this Society may become if she were to depart from her original programme, or forget which should be the true aim of every scientific body. I am aware that there are many of the leading geographers of this country who are fully sensible of the present state of their science in England; and in time, I have no doubt that the Royal Geographical Society will resume its sphere of scientific usefulness.

So much misconception and confusion have arisen in this country with regard to the word anthropology, that I believe our real claims are not yet fully understood even by the leading members of the

British Association. Their recent legislation in assigning the "science of man" to the Biological Section, and retaining "ethnology" in Section E, sufficiently indicates the crude notions which exist respecting the "science of man." According to this legislation, ethnology is not the "science of man," nor any part of it, or why keep it in another section? I can hardly understand how it is that ethnologists have not raised their voices against such a decision. However opinions may differ respecting the definitions of the word ethnology, I cannot imagine any valid reasons for their not uniting with us to obtain a special section for the science of man. The present state of things seems far worse for our ethnological brethren than for ourselves. The science of man is now allotted to the Biological Section. We shall feel more at home amongst oysters and lobsters, than when associated with the students of surface geology, commonly called geography. The Council of the British Association who came to this decision, are henceforth to decide all similar points. The confusion which this is likely to cause is delightful to contemplate. We shall watch with much interest what papers are read under the title of ethnology. Those treating of the science of man will necessarily, according to the present arrangements, be read in the section to which the science of man is to be sent. This, however, is not expressed in the report of the Committee of Recommendations. They merely advised "that no special section or sub-section be established for the science of man." This is just the point on which all who study the science of man, or any important department of that science, must logically be at issue.

As long as this state of things lasts, it will be our duty to continually reiterate the fact that the science of anthropology is a part of no other science. Anthropology is not, like geography, a mere portion of another science. In one sense, anthropology is no doubt a branch of the science of life—biology. We can, however, imagine no real man of science coming forward and advocating that anthropology should be studied with infusoria and fungi. Whatever may be our opinion of man's relation to the rest of the animal kingdom, all must admit that, for the purposes of study, it is desirable we should separate him from both animals and plants.

Our Society has had many charges laid against it; and it is fortunate that it is not ourselves who place man amongst animals and plants. We, on the contrary, are all agreed that the many phenomena presented by the study of mankind, are of such a different nature to those met with in the study of the other mammalia, that it is expedient, advisable, and indeed necessary, that he should be studied in a separate department.

It was not, perhaps, entirely a fine sense of delicacy on the part of some anthropologists, at the recent meeting of the British Association at Birmingham, which animated them to refuse reading their papers on the science of man in a zoological and botanical section: but I believe that such action was based on something far better and more rational than mere sentimentality.

I have dwelt at some length upon the opposition our Society has received at the hands of some members of the British Association. In

some cases, I believe that this opposition has been given to our demands for judicious reasons. Older and wiser men than some of us are of opinion that young societies should fight their way, and make good their position step by step, and such is our intention.

I have good reason for believing that the adverse votes of some were given rather for the purpose of stimulating us to increased activity, than from any desire to injure the cause of our science. I trust it may be eventually seen that this was the true motive for passing the resolution that there should be no special section for the science of man.

I hope our foreign associates will take care to make this view of the matter known amongst our fellow students on the continent. If we look at the matter in this light, we are under deep obligations to the authorities of the British Association. We appreciate their kindness, and thank them for their support. We in England can fully understand such motives; but I fear that they may be misunderstood on the continent. I am free to confess, that I for some time thought that the motives for opposing us were of a different nature; but I am glad now to believe that such may not be the case. We are now considered to be on our trial, both as men of science and as a scientific body.

I have long been convinced that our position in the British Association is of little or no consequence, if we only carry out honestly and truly the objects of our society. Let us remember that the British Association for the Advancement of Science forms no part of anthropological science. We are, as regards that body, mere innovators; and they are perfectly justified in seeing that we make good our title to admittance before they accede to our demands.

We shall best do this by continuing the work we have begun. Above all things, we must avoid exhibiting a slavish desire to please the magnates of science, or to court public applause.

It is a necessary law, I presume, that all young societies and young sciences should go through a period of trial, and encounter opposition from the masses of society. It is, therefore, not surprising that, during the past year, our young society has been attacked with a virulence and an energy which we could not but admire. Early in the year it became the duty of the Fellows of the Society to discuss the influence of the civilised on the uncivilised man, brought before us by Mr. Winwood Reade, in a paper entitled "On the Influence of Christian Missionaries amongst Savages." The abuse immediately levelled at the Society, by the so-called religious press of this country, was remarkable both for the vehemence of the language employed, and for the harmony which prevailed amongst the oppositionists, who united *en masse* against us. If noise and strong language could have stopped the working of this Society, there was enough of it during the time we had the temerity to discuss the influence of missionary labours.

An important question arises for our consideration on this subject. Does such a question as the one named come legitimately within the sphere of this Society? I must say a few words on this point, because I believe that there are some who consider that such a question is be-

yond the bounds of the science of man. The question for us to consider was, the influence of civilised on uncivilised man ; and I do not presume that any one will deny that such a question comes legitimately within the sphere of this Society. If we admit this, we at once see that the only other charge which could be brought against the title of Mr. Reade's paper was, that it singled out a special class. There was certainly no special reason why the class of Christian missionaries should have been selected, more than that of travellers, traders, or colonists, who, like missionaries, come in contact with uncivilised races. The charge of a paper being more special is, to us, rather an advantage than otherwise. But nothing could be more erroneous than to assume that, because a Fellow of our Society took up the special question of the influence of missionaries amongst savages, the Society could in any way be charged with hostility to this particular class of men. This discussion illustrates many other questions connected with the science of man. There are many subjects which cannot be said to be strictly within the domain of our science ; yet only by investigating these subjects can we judge of their value, as affording material wherewith to build up our edifice. The discussion on Christian missionaries was not a pleasurable excursion into this "debateable land"; the noise on that occasion was terrific, and the tone and language entirely foreign to scientific modes of thought. Even the strong nerves of some of our own members, who had taken part in the battles of our Society during the two previous years, were somewhat shaken, and that evening they were appalled at the danger which they considered us to be in : now, however, that it is past, we may look back temperately upon that discussion, and take warning by that experience.

Let us, in any future discussion on this point, avoid if possible treating this theme in a manner repugnant to the feelings of any class. But, at the same time, we must do this in no timorous spirit of avoiding the opposition which we shall necessarily have to encounter, but simply do our duty as a scientific body, without passion or prejudice. It has been stated, on reliable authority, that the discussions before our Society have had the effect of advancing missionary societies. We trust they will, on some fitting occasion, reciprocate our good offices. This fact may also another time make the parties less vehement in their opposition to, and denunciation of, mere pilgrims—seekers after truth. A small society like our own, can have but little power against the numerous and powerful missionary organisations which exist in this country ; unless, at least, we have truth on our side, putting aside our individual opinions on such questions, but admitting our right to discuss them. I would fain wish, were such a thing possible, that missionaries would calmly unite with us to investigate the matter we discussed last year. The Bishop of Natal has led the way, and I cannot but think that other missionaries will follow his example. It should be the wish of missionaries to give us all the information and assistance in their power.

We have been blamed for touching on any religious matters, and some of our well-wishers have suggested that it might be prudent to

avoid all questions which in any way bear on religion. I regret that we cannot act upon this well-meant suggestion. Religion is essentially an anthropological character, and in that light we shall always have to consider it. We cannot even describe the psychological characters of the different races, without dwelling on the tendency of some to believe in monotheism, and of others in polytheism. No anthropologist, worthy of the name, can fail to observe these things, or to record them.

While, however, it is our duty to take cognisance of what men do believe, we disclaim every wish or desire to prescribe for them what they ought or ought not to believe. It is here we draw the line of demarcation; and those who take the trouble to examine it, will be compelled to avow that it is a broad and distinct one.

We are a young society, and desire to conform as far as possible to the existing rules of scientific societies; but this conformation with old-established societies must be more that of spirit than of action. Founded as our Society is on many of the rules of the Geological Society, I hope the same spirit of independence and determination to fight against public opinion exists amongst us, as existed, and even now exists, amongst some of the great champions of scientific truth and freedom of inquiry, such as Buckland, Adam Sedgwick, De la Beeche, Lyell, Darwin; and, indeed, all these men have shown that they valued the cause of truth more than public applause.

This sympathy with all true scientific workers of the day, I hope will always exist amongst us: but the working out of the administration of our Society cannot be done precisely on any existing model. Our success has been unprecedented in the history of scientific societies of this metropolis; and this success must be ascribed more to the suitability of our plan to the wants of the time than to any other cause. We must strive to imitate what is good in all societies; and we can estimate at their true value the denunciations of those whose language is of that nature which can alone be dictated by rancorous jealousy.

Great as has been the success of our parent society in Paris, it bears, as M. Broca writes me, no comparison to the rapid progress our own Society has made within so short a time. It affords me much gratification, also, to announce that the part of our plan which has been much condemned in some quarters, viz., the publication of translations of foreign works, is to be followed by our fellow students at Moscow. We must all rejoice that such is to be the case. Let us never forget that there is but one science of anthropology, although there are many languages in which that science is enunciated. The Moscow society intend to publish their own works in Russian, into which language English works are to be translated. I mention this fact with peculiar gratification, because it illustrates the appreciation of the plan of our own Society.

It is of importance, also, that we should enlarge our sphere of usefulness by increasing the number of our Fellows, or we shall not long be able to retain the leading position, as regards numbers, which we now possess amongst the different anthropological societies

of Europe. Our Madrid associates, although they have only just commenced their sittings, have already three hundred members enrolled. The first number of their Journal is shortly expected to appear; and altogether there is an amount of activity and zeal in this young society, which is both gratifying and encouraging to us.

Our fellow-students across the Channel acknowledge and remind us of the fact, that our opportunities for the study of anthropology are far greater than their own. The large colonial possessions of this country bring us into close contact with nearly every existing race of man. This has been going on for generations, yet to our national shame be it said, our anthropological museums are far inferior to those of the French, or even of the Danes. The state of the crania in large museums, like that of the Edinburgh Antiquarian Museum, and the Hunterian Museum at Glasgow, is simply a disgrace to our science.

When recently in Orkney, I was informed of the destruction of crania which had been found associated with stone and bone implements.* Large numbers were found at one place. The stone and bone implements were taken, but the skulls were left to be destroyed. If such things are going on in this country, we cannot wonder at the small amount of attention and care given to the collection of crania in our colonies. It is to enable us to cope somewhat with the neglect of our science that we have organised a staff of local secretaries. Eventually, I have no doubt, this department will work well. The fact that we have yet seen but little result from it, must be attributed to a great extent to a want of a sufficient staff to work out properly a large undertaking of this nature.

Some look at our success as unprecedented up to this time; but without any desire to depreciate what we have hitherto effected, I must express my opinion that our work is still only beginning. What we have done, has, I believe, been effected by genuine work, and by a unity of action between the officers and the Fellows of the Society generally. We want now to bring our local secretaries more immediately into sympathy and action with the Society.

These things will, I have no doubt, all be effected in time. All our continental Associates look to us to utilise the enormous anthropological riches which belong to this country, and I trust we may be able to satisfy their high expectations. This must, however, be a work of time. We shall merely be able to make collections which future generations may utilise. Tribes of men are constantly becoming extinct, and we shall be guilty of neglect if we omit doing all in our power to procure sufficient typical specimens of crania while we have it in our power. The neglect I have referred to in this country is not simply a deficiency of crania, but we possess also a very limited collection of works of industry of the different races of man. If we judge of what was achieved in a few years by the late lamented Henry Christy, we shall have sufficient encouragement, to

* See Wilson, also, who gives an account of the destruction of twenty-seven skulls in Orkney. "Prehistoric Annals of Scotland", vol. i, p. 120.

be sure of being rewarded for our labour when we once set seriously to work.

Our Library, too, possesses only a small number of books ; others must be obtained with as little delay as possible. I trust that, before another anniversary, both our Museum and Library will be greatly developed. The Council have committed both the Museum and Library to Mr. Blake's entire charge, and have freed him of other duties in order that he shall be able to devote sufficient time to the Library and Museum.

I shall avoid, on this occasion, alluding to the works which have been published on the various branches of anthropology during the past year. It will now become the duty of your Librarian to keep a complete record of all books published on our science, and I have no doubt that this record will be published for the use of the Fellows. A large number of pamphlets and articles are continually appearing on the different subjects connected with anthropology ; and to keep a complete record of these, together with the titles of all papers contributed to the different anthropological societies, cannot fail to assist materially those who are engaged in the study of our science. Mr. Blake, I believe, will endeavour to make this record complete from the time of the formation of our Society. While we have confided the Museum and Library to Mr. Blake, we have had the good fortune to obtain the services of our late Honorary Secretary, Mr. J. Frederick Collingwood, as Assistant Secretary. I cannot but heartily congratulate the Society on having secured the services of a gentleman so eminently qualified for the office as we know Mr. Collingwood to be.

During the past year the Council have been consulted as to the expediency of forming local branches of the Anthropological Society in the chief towns of Great Britain. For the present we have advised the postponement of any such attempt. If we once begin a system of branch societies, we should endeavour to do so on an extended scale. We have had applications on this subject from India and Australia, and the time will come when we must be prepared to act in this matter. We are simply waiting for sufficient strength to carry out such a large undertaking. If we wish to keep the position we have assumed we must continue to march onward. Since our foundation, societies for the study of anthropology have been developed all over the world in a manner unexpected to many.

Having touched on a few points in connection with the development of our Society during the past year, let me now make some observations on the position of anthropology both in this country and throughout Europe. We are rejoiced to see that our science is becoming developed in this country, not only by members of our own Society, but also by many who have not yet united with us. The study of mankind has acquired a life and vitality which the leaders of some of the older scientific societies seem to think entirely disproportionate to its merits. Men of the last generation fail to see that anthropology is the science of sciences. But there is no mistaking the tendency of the age. Scientific men, like Professors Huxley and Rolleston, who, a few years ago were devoting their energies and talents to palæon-

tology and zoology, are now aiding us in our work. Professor Huxley has been both lecturing and writing on our science.

An organisation has been started during the past year, entitled the "Anthropological Lecturing Club," whose chief object, it appears, is to attempt to popularise our science. The Anthropological Lecturing Club, like all other young institutions, will have to fight its own way in the world, and is, I believe, competent to do this without any help from myself. To those who have watched the gradual change which time has wrought in public opinion with regard to our Society, the manner in which the club was ushered into the world is full of encouragement for its future success. The attacks made on this club reminded us of the shouts of execration with which we were greeted from a portion of the intelligent leaders of public opinion in our younger days. But if this denunciation of lectures on anthropology is based on truth or justice, is it a wider application than those who attack it seem to think! I do not now feel called upon to justify an attempt to popularise either anthropology or any other natural science. I am fully conscious that, on such a point, there is a considerable difference of opinion existing amongst men of science. I am, however, free to avow myself entirely in favour of the diffusion of all useful knowledge, and even of the elements of our science amongst the thinking public. Men of this generation can hardly remain silent and inactive when they see the evil effects of the ignorance of anthropology both in our statesmen and our politicians. The great question of "RACE" underlies the whole of their efforts, but they fail, or refuse to see it. It is melancholy to reflect that the destinies of nations are entrusted to men who look with supreme contempt on all such "vulgar errors" as race-distinctions. Perhaps the man who, more than any other statesman of our time, has shown himself incapable of seeing the facts in their true light, is the present prime minister of England. Educated in the pseudo-philanthropic school of Wilberforce and other well-intentioned men, he is ignorant of the merest elements of the science of comparative anthropology; or even of the well-ascertained and undisputed race-distinctions on which that science is based.

Upwards of fifteen years ago, one of the most eminent anthropologists of the country, declared that there would be a Negro revolt in Jamaica. I quote Dr. Knox's own words: * "From Santo Domingo, he (the Negro) drove out the Celt; from Jamaica he will expel the Saxon; and the expulsion of the Lusitanian from Brazil is only an affair of time."

These words appear to the mind of the vulgar prophetic; but they were based on sound theories, ignored by nearly all our then statesmen. Some of our countrymen, however, do not spend their lives amongst diverse races of man without learning something practical as to their psychological and moral characteristics. In the recent outbreak in Jamaica, the Negro found himself overmatched; and we anthropologists have looked on, with intense admiration, at the conduct of Governor Eyre as that of a man of whom England ought to be

* "Races of Men", 1850, p. 456.

(and some day will be) justly proud. The merest novice in the study of race-characteristics ought to know that we English can only successfully rule either Jamaica, New Zealand, the Cape, China, or India, by such men as Governor Eyre.

Such revolutions will occur wherever the Negro is placed in unnatural relations with Europeans. Statesmen have yet to be taught the true practical value of race-distinctions, and the absolute impossibility of applying the civilisation and laws of one race to another race of man essentially distinct. Statesmen may ignore the existence of race-antagonism; but it exists nevertheless. They may continue to plead that race-subordination forms no part of nature's laws; but this will not alter the facts. All who have candidly studied the question know that, if there be one truth more clearly defined than another in anthropological science, it is the existence of well-marked psychological and moral distinctions in the different races of man.

The sublime contempt which a portion of our politicians have for the opinions of those who have studied the Negro all their lives, would be amusing, were it not melancholy and pregnant with consequences of the most momentous nature. I allude to these facts from this chair because the next generation will then be better able to understand the gigantic work which we have before us. We can easily understand why those powerful organisations called missionary societies get up public meetings, condemning such men as Mr. Eyre, in unmeasured terms of abuse, but we cannot understand statesmen pandering to the prejudices and passions of the mob. If missionary societies have such a power amongst our ignorant masses, how can we wonder at their influence on men like the Negro, who have little to guide them, save passion and feeling?

I have alluded to Earl Russell once, and I regret to have to do so a second time. The present case is one on which I am sure I shall gain the undivided sympathy of the Fellows of this Society. I wish to take this opportunity of pleading the cause of a poor neglected Fellow of this Society, who has the misfortune to be in the service of the present government of Great Britain, and whose name is Captain Cameron. The Christian monarch who now holds our fellow-student in chains, has rendered all who have the name of Englishmen utterly contemptible to his countrymen. Delay to the African mind is victory. We are now at the mercy of the King of Abyssinia, whether we shall ever see our friend again. A little prompt action on the part of our then foreign secretary of state, might have saved him from all his sufferings, and the name of Englishmen from disgrace. It may be too late now to save Captain Cameron, but I think I do not go beyond the bounds of the President of this Society when I publicly proclaim and denounce the apathy which has existed in the government of this country with regard to him.

Should Captain Cameron again fortunately return to us, he will be able, perhaps, to add a few more facts to what is already known with regard to the African race; but his experience, we suppose, will receive just as much attention as though he had never left his native country. A Fellow of our Society—Dr. Jules Blanc—has gone to

attempt his rescue with Mr. Rassam, and I sincerely trust their efforts may be crowned with success.

Is it our duty to "rest" or be "thankful," whilst such things are going on? Is it not rather incumbent on us to raise a protest against the manner in which well ascertained facts with regard to race distinctions are argued by those whose duty it is to become acquainted with them? If this Society fails to publish to the world all the facts at present known with regard to this question, she will not be discharging her duty or fulfilling her place in the development of true scientific principles for human guidance. Let us not "rest," but rather arouse those whose duty it is to carry out our deductions, to a sense of their responsibility, if they neglect truths so clearly demonstrated as race-antagonism and race-subordination can be. In these two phrases are summed up great and permanent truths. Neither race-antagonism nor race-subordination was invented by us; they were simply phrases to express truths, which were as true thousands of years ago as at the present day. The existence of both is demonstrated by facts. It is an error to suppose they are mere hypotheses; they are, on the contrary, theories founded upon all authentic history, and upon well ascertained facts.

The time will come—whether we shall live to see it I know not—when a knowledge of the science of anthropology will be required of all seeking appointments in our colonial or foreign possessions, and when our statesmen will be required to act on the deductions of our science. The time, too, will surely come, when it will be made a branch of national education; when the professor of history in our universities shall become the professor of historical anthropology; and when the professor of political economy shall become the professor of comparative anthropology.

Opinions may differ as to the time required to effect such changes; but our science cannot fail ere long to be recognised in some form, even by those who are most opposed to what they suppose to be its teaching. These are things, however, of the future, and I only mention them now to urge all to renewed exertions on behalf of our sublime science. If we but once realise not only the grandeur, but also the practical advantage of anthropology, we shall no longer look with wonder at its development, but be ready to put our shoulder to the wheel. There are yet hundreds, if not thousands of men in this country who could render our science good service if they only realised its scope and practical bearing.

Our Society at present is only the nucleus round which we may all work according to our lights. It is true that we have refused many who have sought admission to us; but we have only done this when we considered that such applicants were not likely to render service to the cause of science. The different shades of scientific opinion which are now represented in our Society, form the best guarantee for the free and full discussion of the topics brought before us. It is gratifying for us to know that the resignations this year have been relatively fewer than on any previous year. A young society is always liable to lose a large number of its early adherents. There are a large number

of restless minded men who seek admission into any young society, hoping to find a congenial sphere for the display of their surplus energy, and wherein they can ventilate their individual crotchets. We have had some such amongst us ; but they were not a class likely to aid our Society or our science. Scientific societies are not intended to be theatres for the display of the eccentricities of their members, or for the ventilation of individual crotchets or erudities, but for the real advancement of science.

A Presbyterian divine has recently well observed :* “ This is pre-eminently an age of science, and the culture of this age is emphatically scientific. Men may, therefore, be great classical scholars, and possessed of the highest culture of a certain sort, but unless they possess the training, or are imbued with the spirit of science, it is the culture of another age, not of this. Now all who possess such a training and spirit, believe in the undeviating constancy and order of nature’s methods or laws. Science could not proceed a step without such a belief.” Our Society seeks only such fellow-labourers as are really imbued with this spirit ; for, unless they are so, they cannot aid the cause of true science. We desire men who can be both logical and consistent ; for it is by such alone that science can be advanced.

We want all who sympathise with our labours ; and we welcome to our ranks all real seekers for truth, and all advocates of free inquiry. The real enemies of truth are those who would stifle inquiry, and desire to temporise with popular ignorance, arrogance, and superstition. Mankind have nothing to fear from the study of themselves. On the contrary, they will gain much by a better knowledge of their natural relations to one another, and to the rest of the organic world. While, however, we invite others to join us, we must remember that the work of this Society and the development of anthropological science in this country now devolves on ourselves. Let us all be stimulated to renewed exertion to forward the cause of truth during the coming year. Let each man use the whole of his individual influence and talent on behalf of the common cause, in order that on our next anniversary we may be able to rejoice, not only in continued but in increased prosperity.

* “ Divine Providence in its Relation to Prayer and Plagues.” By Rev. James Cranbrook. Edinburgh : 1865.

Anthropological Society of London,

4, ST. MARTIN'S PLACE, TRAFALGAR SQUARE.



THIS SOCIETY is formed with the object of promoting the study of Anthropology in a strictly scientific manner. It proposes to study Man in all his leading aspects, physical, mental, and historical; to investigate the laws of his origin and progress; to ascertain his place in nature and his relations to the inferior forms of life; and to attain these objects by patient investigation, careful induction, and the encouragement of all researches tending to establish a *de facto* science of man. No Society existing in this country has proposed to itself these aims, and the establishment of this Society, therefore, is an effort to meet an obvious want of the times.

This it is proposed to do :

First. By holding Meetings for the reading of papers and the discussion of various anthropological questions.

Second. By the publication of reports of papers and abstracts of discussions in the form of a Quarterly Journal; and also by the publication of the principal memoirs read before the Society, in the form of Transactions.

Third. By the appointment of Officers, or Local Secretaries, in different parts of the world, to collect systematic information. It will be the object of the Society to indicate the class of facts required, and thus tend to give a systematic development to Anthropology.

Fourth. By the establishment of a carefully collected and reliable Museum, and a good reference Library.

Fifth. By the publication of a series of works on Anthropology which will tend to promote the objects of the Society. These works will generally be translations; but original works will also be admissible.

Translations of the following works are now ready.

Dr. THEODOR WAITZ. Anthropology of Primitive Peoples. First Volume. Edited from the German by J. Frederiek Collingwood, Esq., F.R.S.L., F.G.S., F.A.S.L., with Corrections and Additions by the Author. Price 16s.

BROCA, Dr. Paul. On the Phenomena of Hybridity in the Genus Homo. Edited from the French by C. Carter Blake, Esq., F.G.S., F.A.S.L. Price 5s.

POUCHET, Georges. On the Plurality of the Human Race. Edited from the French (Second Edition), by H. J. C. Beavan, Esq., F.R.G.S., Hon. Sec. A.S.L. 7s. 6d.

CARL VOGT. Lectures on Man: his Place in Creation and in the History of the Earth. Edited by Dr. James Hunt, F.S.A., F.R.S.L., Pres. A.S.L. Price 16s.

BLUMENBACH, J. F., The Life and Anthropological Treatises of; with the Inaugural Dissertation of Dr. JOHN HUNTER. By T. Bendyshe, Esq., M.A., V.P. A.S.L., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Price 16s.

GASTALDI, Cavaliere Bartolomeo. Lake Habitations and Prehistoric Remains in Northern and Central Italy. Translated from the Italian by Charles Harecourt Chambers, M.A., F.A.S.L. Price 7s. 6d.

Memoirs of the Anthropological Society of London. Vol. I. Price £1:1.

The publication of the following works is contemplated :—

RETZIUS, PROFESSOR. The Anthropological Works of. Edited by A. Higgins, Esq., Hon. For. Sec. A.S.L.

GRATIOLET. Mémoire sur les Plis Cérébraux de l'Homme et des Primates. 4to, Paris, 1855. Edited by Dr. Daniel H. Tuke.

Dr. THEODOR WAITZ, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Marburg. Anthropologie der Naturvölker. 1861. Second Volume. Edited by J. Frederiek Collingwood, Esq., F.G.S., F.R.S.L., F.A.S.L.

- A. DE QUATREFAGES. *Unité de l'Espèce Humaine*. Edited by G. F. Rolph Esq., F.A.S.L. 8vo. Paris, 1861.
 VON BAER, KARL ERNST, *The Anthropological Works of*.
 GOSSE. *Mémoire sur les Déformations Artificielles du Crâne*. 8vo. Paris, 1855.
 BORY DE ST. VINCENT. *Essai zoologique sur le genre humain*. 2 vols. Paris, 3rd ed., 1836. Edited by S. E. Bouverie-Pusey, Esq., F.A.S.L., F.E.S.
 CRULL. *Dissertatio anthropologico-medica de Cranio, ejusque ad faciem ratione*. 8vo. Gröningen, 1810.
 LUCAS, DR. PROSPER. *Traité sur l'hérédité*. 2 vols.
 An *Encyclopædia of Anthropological Science*. Edited by T. Bendyshe, Esq., M.A., V.P. A.S.L., and other Contributors.
 GOBINEAU. *De l'Inégalité des Races Humaines*.

Sixth. By the appointment, from time to time, of various Committees authorised to report to the Society on particular topics which may be referred to them; the results of such investigations being in all cases communicated to the Society.

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL FOR 1866.

President.

James Hunt, Esq., Ph.D., F.S.A., F. & Hon. For. Sec. R.S.L., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Society of Paris, etc.

Vice-Presidents.

Captain Richard F. Burton, H.M. Consul at Santos, etc.
 Dr. Berthold Seemann, F.L.S., Vice-President of the Imperial Academy of Dresden.
 T. Bendyshe, Esq., M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.
 Richard Stephen Charnock, Esq., Ph.D., F.S.A., F.R.G.S., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Society of Paris.

Honorary Secretaries.

W. Bollaert, Esq., Corr. Mem. Univ. Chile, and Ethnological Soc. London & New York.
 Hugh J. C. Beavan, Esq., F.R.G.S.

Honorary Foreign Secretary.

Alfred Higgins, Esq., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Society of Paris.

Treasurer.

Rev. Dunbar I. Heath, M.A., F.R.S.L., F.R.A.S.

COUNCIL.

S. Edwin Collingwood, Esq., F.Z.S.
 J. W. Conrad Cox, Esq., B.A., F.G.S.
 George D. Gibb, Esq., M.A., M.D., LL.D., F.G.S., &c.
 J. Meyer Harris, Esq., F.R.G.S.
 Henry Hotze, Esq.
 G. W. Marshall, Esq., LL.M.
 Viscount Milton, M.P., F.R.G.S.
 George North, Esq.
 Luke Owen Pike, Esq., M.A.
 George Frederick Rolph, Esq.
 C. Robert des Ruffières, Esq., F.G.S., F.E.S.
 T. Tate, Esq., F.R.A.S.
 William Travers, Esq., F.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.
 W. S. W. Vaux, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., F. and Hon. Sec. R.S.L., President of the Numismatic Society of London.

Curator and Librarian.

C. Carter Blake, Esq., F.G.S., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Societies of Paris, Spain, and Moscow.

Assistant Secretary.

J. Frederick Collingwood, Esq., F.R.S.L., F.G.S., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Society of Paris.

The Subscription is Two Guineas per annum, which will entitle every Fellow to admission to the Meetings, one copy of the Quarterly Journal, the Memoirs of the Society, and a Volume (or Volumes) of the Translations printed by the Society. Life Members, Twenty Guineas.

Further particulars will be forwarded on application to the Honorary Secretaries.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Now Ready, in 1 vol., 8vo., pp. 400, price 16s., cloth,

Waitz's Introduction to Anthropology.

Edited, from the FIRST VOLUME of *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, by J. FREDERICK COLLINGWOOD, F.R.S.L., F.G.S., F.A.S.L., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Society of Paris.

Now ready, in 1 vol. 8vo., pp. 134, price 5s., cloth.

On the Phenomena of Hybridity in the Genus

HOMO. By Dr. PAUL BROCA, Secrétaire Général à la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris. Edited by C. CARTER BLAKE, F.G.S., F.A.S.L.

Now ready, in 1 vol. 8vo., pp. 172, price 7s. 6d. cloth,

The Plurality of the Human Race: by

GEORGES POUCHET, M.D., Licentiate of Nat. Science, Corr. Mem. Anthropol. Soc. of London. Translated and Edited from the Second Edition, by HUGH J. C. BEAVAN, Esq., F.R.G.S., F.A.S.L., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

Now ready, in 1 vol., 8vo., pp. 498, with 127 Woodcuts, price 16s., cloth.

Lectures on Man; his Place in Creation, and

IN THE HISTORY OF THE EARTH. By DR. CARL VOGT, Professor of Natural History in the University of Geneva, Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Society of Paris. Edited by JAMES HUNT, Ph.D., F.S.A., F.R.S.L., F.A.S.L., Honorary Foreign Secretary of the Royal Society of Literature of Great Britain, Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Society of Paris, Corresponding Member of the Medical Association of Hesse-Darmstadt and the Upper Hesse Society for Natural and Medical Science, and President of the Anthropological Society of London.

Now ready, pp. 420, price 16s.,

Blumenbach (J. F.), Lives and Anthropological

TREATISES of, including the *De Generis Humani Varietate Nativa*, and the *Dissertatio Inauguralis* of Dr. John Hunter. Translated and Edited by T. BENDYSHE, Esq., M.A., V.P.A.S.L., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

London: LONGMAN and Co., Paternoster Row.

Just published, price 7s. 6d.

Lake Habitations and Prehistoric Remains

in the TURBARIES and MARL-BEDS of NORTHERN and CENTRAL ITALY. By BARTOLOMEO GASTALDI, Professor of Mineralogy in the School of Engineering of Turin. Translated from the Italian and Edited by CHARLES HARCOURT CHAMBERS, M.A., F.R.G.S., F.A.S.L.

London: LONGMAN, GREEN, and Co., Paternoster Row.

Price 1s., pp. 60,

On the Negro's Place in Nature. Read before

the Anthropological Society of London, November 17th, 1863. By JAMES HUNT, Ph.D., F.S.A., F.R.S.L., Foreign Associate of the Anthropological Society of Paris, President of the Anthropological Society of London.

London: TRÜBNER and Co., 60, Paternoster Row.

Just Published, price 1s.

(SPECIAL NUMBER OF THE POPULAR MAGAZINE OF ANTHROPOLOGY.)

The Negro and Jamaica. By Commander

BEDFORD PIM, R.N. Read before the Anthropological Society of London, February 1st, 1866, at St. James's Hall.

London: TRÜBNER and Co., 60, Paternoster Row.